

## REMARKS

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-20 were pending. Claims 1-15 were allowed, and Claims 17-19 were identified as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 16 and 20 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1, 16, and 20 are amended; and Claims 21 and 22 are added. Claims 1, 16, and 20 are amended to correct informalities. Claims 1-22 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

**Allowable Subject Matter (1-15 and 17-19)**

Applicants appreciate the indication that Claims 1-15 are allowed and thank the Examiner for his work on this matter.

Claims 17-19 were identified as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 17-19 depend from an allowable claim for at least the reasons stated below.

### **Rejection to Claims 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed. "When the meaning of the claim would reasonably be understood by persons of ordinary skill when read in light of the specification, the claim is not subject to invalidity upon departure from the protocol of 'antecedent basis.'" *Energizer Holds, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n* (Fed. Cir. 2006).

However, the point is moot in light of the amendment to Claims 16 and 20. Claims 16 and 20 were amended for increased clarity. Because Claims 16 and 20 as originally written were valid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to Claims 16 and 20 are not made for any reason related to patentability. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that neither

the scope of Claim 16 nor the scope of Claim 20 is narrowed by the amendments made to Claim 16 and Claim 20 in this paper.

### **Rejection to Claims 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,194,962). Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn with respect to Claim 16 at least because Chen fails to disclose, “enabling the transconductance of the input circuit to be relatively constant for a common mode voltage of the differential input signal”, as recited in Applicants’ Claim 16.

The Office Action states that Chen anticipates Claim 16, and that “the transconductance claimed is inherent from CMOS transistors (MN1, MN2, MP1, MP2)”. However, it is respectively submitted that the transconductance is not inherently constant. Rather, the transconductance of a MOS transistor inherently varies with drain current ( $I_D$ ). The transconductance of a MOSFET in the subthreshold region of operation is proportional to the drain current. The transconductance of a MOSFET in the saturation operation is proportional to the square root of the drain current.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn with respect to Claim 20 at least for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to Claim 16.

### New Claims 21 and 22

Claim 21 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because it depends from Claim 20. Claim 22 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because it depends from Claim 16.

## CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-22) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding

patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: September 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Matthew M. Gaffney

Registration No.: 46,717

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant